UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/866,857	05/30/1997	DAVID CORBOY	06651/008001	1383

26171 7590 07/24/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER
HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/866,857	CORBOY, DAVID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 June 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-16,31-50 and 63-99* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-16,31-50 and 63-99* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed on 6/24/03 to the application filed on 05/30/97.

2. Claims 12, 17-30, 51-62, 69, 75, 81 are canceled.

3. Claims 85-99 are added.

4. Claims 1-11, 13-16, 31-50, 63-99 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 67, 73, 79 are independent claims.

5. The objections of claims 31, 71, and 83 for having wrong dependency have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

6. The objections of claims 69, 75, and 81 for including the informalities have been withdrawn in view of the cancellation of these claims.

7. The rejections of claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-16, 63-84 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.

8. The rejections of claims 31-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw and further in view of Caire have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.

9. The rejections of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw and further in view of Ando have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.

10. The rejections of claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw and further in view of Johnson have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-4, 9-11, 13-16, 63-68, 70-74, 76-80, 82-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw et al., *Microsoft Office 6-in-1*, Que Corporation 1994, pages 379-380, 384-389, 396-402, 419-425, 492-496 in view of Gertler, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Microsoft PowerPoint 97*, Que Corporation 1996, pages 29-36, 112-118.

Regarding independent claim 1, Shaw discloses:

- encapsulating within a single file at least two objects, each object including data for the object (pages 396-402: the whole slide presentation is considered as a multimedia file including at least two slides which relate to each other to provide data for the presentation, wherein the data in each slide can be text, pictures, charts objects; the slide presentation file including at least two slides is considered as a single file encapsulating at least two objects, which are slides, within the file, with data such as text, graphics)
- downloading the multimedia document to enable an ordered display of the objects by a recipient based on the temporal order defined by the document order and unaffected by an input of the recipient, the ordered display being

independent of a bandwidth of a communications channels used to send the multimedia document (pages 30-32: the capability of displaying a slide presentation in order from slide to slide after a specific number of seconds suggests the downloading of the multimedia document in that specific order to display to a recipient and such order is unaffected by an input of the recipient since the order is set up in advance by the document author; since the ordered display is defined by the author in advance, the display is independent of the bandwidth of a communication channels used to send the multimedia document)

Shaw does not explicitly disclose:

- each object in the multimedia document includes the choreography information defined by a document author and defining a relationship between the objects within a multimedia document to dictate a temporal order of presentation between the objects in conjunction with the data of the objects

Gertler discloses:

- including a footer in each slide where the author can include any information for the slide such as Date or Slide Number (pages 113, 117: each slide has data and *the footer where the author can put the date/time of the presentation, or the slide number defined by the author to show the order of slides in the slide presentation*; page 118: since the author can type "whatever-text-you-want" in the footer including the slide number as above, the text in the footer can be the choreography information dictating the order of presentation via the slide number and defining the relationships between the slides of the slide presentation)

- rearranging the order of the slide show by selecting the desired slides the author wants to move to change the order (page 34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gertler into Shaw since the rearrangement of the slide show defines a new order of slides which is different from the order of the slide show when first created by slide numbers. Further, since the document author can include any text to the footer of each slide for some information, the footer data suggests to include the choreography information in conjunction with the data for each slide where the data footer can be used to define the new order, which is equivalent to the temporal order, of the slide show resulted from the rearrangement of the slides.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw discloses

- changing one object in the data file (pages 400-402: editing slides)
- adding an object to the data file (pages 419-425: adding slides and adding text object in a slide)

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw discloses:

- creating an exclusionary area within the window (page 401, figure 4.4)
- locating an object within the exclusionary area, the object being selected from a group of objects including a framed image, a slide show, framed text, sound data, a separator, or a hyperlink (page 401, figure 4.4: the data in the area within the window can be text and graphics).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw discloses creating an object in the file (page 385: creating a collection of slides) and locating player data within an object defining a player that plays the object (page 396-398: the textual data in each slide is displayed for viewing)

Shaw does not disclose the created object is an unknown object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Shaw to include the created object being an unknown object for the following reason. Shaw provides the interface for each multimedia object thus no matter the object is known or unknown, the system always locates the player associated with the multimedia object.

Independent claim 10 is for a computer system of the method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Shaw discloses that at least one object comprises one of a textual file format, an image file format, and a sound file format (page 401, figure 4.4, each slide can include text and graphic objects).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Shaw discloses that two or more objects have at least one common attribute, including at least one of a command for perception of the object, an ability to pass and receive a message, and an ability to

supply and retrieve the data embodied in the object (page 495: since the display of the slides can be set in a temporal order by the document author, the slides as in the slide stream has the ability to pass and receive a message to automatically advance to the next slide to display the data in the slide).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 10, Shaw does not disclose explicitly that each object is a generic element of the hierarchical data file structure, such that any combination of objects can be grouped together to form a part of the multimedia document. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Shaw to include that feature since it was well known that the slide presentation can contain the subsections of the subtopics to present the topic of the presentation where the slides in the subsections are grouped together to form a part of the slide presentation.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, which are dependent on claim 10, Shaw discloses that the document forms a code segment that receives image information, and wherein the image information is used to construct an image frame for a framed image that is part of the multimedia document (pages 400-401).

Regarding claims 63 and 65, which are dependent on claims 1 and 10 respectively, Shaw discloses that the ordered display is independent of a recipient software program used to render the objects (pages 492-496, figure 21.2: the capability of displaying a

slide presentation in order from slide to slide after a specific number of seconds shows that the ordered display is unaffected by an input of the recipient since the order is set up in advance by the document author; this also shows that the ordered display is independent of a recipient software program used to render the objects).

Regarding claims 64 and 66, which are dependent on claims 63 and 65 respectively, as mentioned in claims 63 and 65 above, the ordered display is independent of the browser used to render the objects so that the display is presented as defined by the document author.

Regarding independent claim 67, Shaw discloses:

- encapsulating within a single file at least two objects (pages 396-402: the whole slide presentation is considered as a multimedia file including at least two slides which relate to each other to provide data for the presentation, wherein the data in each slide can be text, pictures, charts objects; the slide presentation file including at least two slides, therefore, is considered as a single file encapsulating at least two objects within the file where each slide in the multimedia file is an object including data such as text, graphics)
- downloading the multimedia document to enable an ordered display of the objects by a recipient based on the temporal order defined by the document author, wherein the ordered display is unaffected by an input of the recipient (pages 492-496, figure 21.2: the capability of displaying a slide presentation in

order from slide to slide after a specific number of seconds shows the downloading of the multimedia document in such order to display to a recipient and such order is unaffected by an input of the recipient since the order is set up in advance by the document author)

Shaw does not explicitly disclose:

- each object in the multimedia document includes the choreography information defined by a document author and defining a relationship between the objects within a multimedia document to dictate a temporal order of presentation between the objects in conjunction with the data of the object
- defining an explicit relationship of the object to one or more other objects encapsulated within the file to dictate a temporal order of presentation between the objects, wherein the explicit relationship is defined by the document author

Gertler discloses:

- including a footer in each slide where the author can include any information for the slide such as Date or Slide Number (pages 113, 117: each slide has data and *the footer where the author can put the date/time of the presentation, or the slide number defined by the author to show the order of slides in the slide presentation*; page 118: since the author can type "whatever-text-you-want" in the footer including the slide number as above, the text in the footer can be the choreography information dictating the order of presentation via the slide numbers and defining the relationships between the slides of the slide presentation)

- rearranging the order of the slide show by selecting the desired slides the author wants to move to change the order (page 34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gertler into Shaw since the rearrangement of the slide show defines a new order of slides which is different from the order of the slide show when first created. Further, since the document author can include any text to the footer of each slide for some information of each slide, the footer data suggests to include the choreography information in conjunction with the data for each slide where the data footer can be used to define the new order, which is equivalent to the temporal order, of the slide show resulted from the rearrangement.

Regarding claim 68, which is dependent on claim 67, Shaw does not explicitly disclose that the ordered display is unaffected by a bandwidth of a communication channel used to send the multimedia document.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Shaw to include the independence of a bandwidth when sending the multimedia document to a user and to render incrementally the objects to the user according to the organization for the following reason. The slides are organized in a specific order to present the topic of the slide presentation and also are organized in a temporal order to advance from slide to slide. Rendering of the slides, therefore, is not dependent on a bandwidth since the ordered display is set up in advance by the document author.

Regarding claims 70 and 71, Shaw discloses that the ordered display is independent of a recipient software program used to render the objects (pages 492-496, figure 21.2). Shaw also discloses that the recipient software comprises a browser, and wherein the ordered display is independent of the browser (pages 492-496: as mentioned above, the display of the slide presentation is unaffected by an input of a user since the display order is defined by the document author; the ordered display, therefore, is independent from the recipient browser so that the display is rendered as defined).

Regarding claim 72, Shaw does not explicitly disclose that the document comprises an HTML page having embedded objects. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Shaw to include an HTML page having embedded objects into the document of Shaw since it was well known that one can include a HTML page with embedded objects in creating the slides.

Claims 73-74, 76-78 are for a program of method claims 67-72, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 79-80, 82-84 are for a system of method claims 67-72, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 85, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw does not disclose that the temporal order is configured to enable display of a subsequently sent object prior to a previously sent object.

Gertler discloses:

- including a footer in each slide where the author can include any information for the slide such as Date or Slide Number (pages 113, 117: each slide has data and *the footer where the author can put the date/time of the presentation, or the slide number defined by the author to show the order of slides in the slide presentation*; page 118: since the author can type "whatever-text-you-want" in the footer including the slide number as above, the text in the footer can be considered as the choreography information dictating the order of presentation and defining the relationships between the slides of the slide presentation)
- rearranging the order of the slide show by selecting the desired slides the author wants to move to change the order (page 34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gertler to include the display of a subsequent sent object prior to previously sent object since the rearrangement of the slide show defines a new order of slides, which is equivalent to the temporal order, so that the slides, which are objects, are displayed one after another as defined. In other words, Gertler suggests the display of a subsequent sent object prior to previously sent object.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gertler into Shaw since the rearrangement of the

slide show in Gerlter defines a new order of slides which is different from the order of the slide show when first created. Further, since the document author can include any text to the footer of each slide for some information of each slide, the footer data suggests to include the choreography information in conjunction with the data for each slide where the data footer can be used to define the new order, which is equivalent to the temporal order, of the slide show resulted from the rearrangement.

Regarding claim 86, which is dependent on claim 1, as in claim 85, Gertler discloses that the temporal order of the slide show is different from the order defined when first creating the slide show. This suggests that the temporal order be independent from the order in which an object is sent.

Regarding claim 87, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw does not disclose that the data defining the explicit relationship between the objects within the multimedia document to dictate the temporal order of the presentation between the objects comprises data defining the explicit relationship between the objects within the multimedia document to dictate the temporal order of presentation between the objects independent of an order of object transmission.
Gertler provides the ability to rearrange the slide show so that the slide presentation will be displayed in different order as defined in the Slide Sorter View by selecting which slides you want to work with and want to move to change the order (pages 31-34).

Gertler further discloses that each slide in the slide presentation includes a footer for an additional information for each slide such as Date or Slide Number where the footer can be a whatever-text-you-want footer (pages 113, 117-118).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gertler to include the choreography information in the footer of each slide since the footer can be a whatever-text-you-want footer. The author, therefore, can include the data defining rearranging of the order of slides as defined in the Slide Sorter View in the footer by selecting which slides you want to work with and also defining the new order of the slide display by specifying which slides are included in the new order using on the slide number in the footer.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gertler into Shaw since the rearrangement of the slide show defines a new order of slides which is different from the order of the slide show when first created. Further, since the document author can include any text to the footer of each slide for some information of each slide, the footer data suggests to include the choreography information in conjunction with the data for each slide where the data footer can be used to define the new order, which is equivalent to the temporal order, of the slide show resulted from the rearrangement. The combination of Gertler into Shaw, therefore, enhances defining of the temporal order for displaying multimedia objects in a desired sequence independent from the originally defined order.

Claims 89-90, 91-93, 94-96, 97-99 include the same limitations as in claims 85-87, and are rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claims 31-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Gertler as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Caire et al. (US Pat No. 5,663,962, 9/2/97, filed 9/15/95).

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent on claim 1, and claims 32-34, which are dependent on claim 31, Shaw and Gertler do not disclose that the choreography information further comprises a header, an object archive for storing information about one or more objects, the object archive including information about the relationship of the object file with the document, and a multiplex section including data for the objects in the document.

Caire discloses:

- a header (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, each packet in the overall stream includes a header)
- an object archive for storing information about the plurality of object files, the object archive including information about *the level of each object file with the hierarchy* (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, each packet of the multimedia stream stores information; col 1, lines 37-52, it is desired for instance to *insert into the complete stream also some subtitles* to be displayed during the presentation....)

- a multiplex section including data for each of the object files of the document (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-9, 45-59)
- the object files in the multiplex section are each played by a player as the multiplex object file is received by a receiver (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Caire into Shaw and Gertler since Caire provides the choreography and the multiplexing features for a multimedia presentation. The combination of Caire, Shaw, and Gertler would provide the relationship of the objects in a multimedia document for easily controlling and changing the presentation of the objects.

Regarding claims 35, 36-39, which are dependent on claims 31 and 35 respectively, Shaw and Gertler do not disclose an object number counter indicating the number of objects, a plurality of object descriptions, each object description describing a corresponding one of the objects, and a choreography group providing information about a first group of objects, a group object counter indicating the number objects in the choreography group, size and type data for each object, header data, data slices of the objects interleaved together, and placing one or more slice size data blocks before one or more of the interleaved data slices, each slice size data block corresponding to a data slice and providing a size of the corresponding data slice.

Caire discloses:

- an object number counter indicating the number of object files (col 2, lines 10-20)

- a plurality of object descriptions, each object description describing a corresponding one of the object files (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, the header includes information of the type of a packet in the multimedia stream)
- a choreography group providing information about a first group of object files (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, packets of different types are included in the overall stream as a sequence of intervals wherein the type of a packet is disclosed in the heading are considered as a choreography group providing information about the object files)
- size and type data for each object file (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, data type of each packet in the multimedia stream)
- header data (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, each packet includes a header)
- the data slices of the object files interleaved together (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, the overall stream is structured as a sequence of intervals called packets, each of which contains data of single type, indicated in a header of the packet itself; since data of different types are arranged in the *sequence of intervals called packets*, the packets which are equivalent to the object files, are interleaved together)
- a first player pointer including an address of a player that plays the choreography group (col 2, lines 3-9, for each interval, the multiplexer has to decide from which the input stream it should take the data in order to construct the packets; this implies that the multiplexer has to decide where to point to play the overall stream which is equivalent to the choreography group as mentioned above)

- locating a plurality of slice size data blocks before the interleaved data slices, each slice size data block corresponding to one of the data slices and providing a size of the corresponding data slice (col 4, lines 45-53, the number of data bytes and the number of header bytes in each packet show the size of each packet which is equivalent to the data block)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Caire into Shaw and Gertler since Caire provides the choreography and the multiplexing features for a multimedia presentation. The combination of Caire, Shaw, and Gertler would provide the relationship of the objects in a multimedia document for easily controlling and changing the presentation of the objects.

Regarding claim 40, which is dependent on claim 31, Shaw and Gertler do not disclose a non-multiplex section following the multiplex section where the non-multiplex section includes one or more separate objects that are not played by a player as the separate object files are received by a receiver. Caire discloses a plurality of separate object files that are not played by a player as the separate object files are received by a receiver (col 1, lines 37-45, ...*video and audio information* have *to be separated* again, by an inverse of demultiplexing process, as presentation occurs on different devices...).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Caire into Shaw and Gertler since Caire provides the choreography and the multiplexing features for a multimedia presentation. The

combination of Caire, Shaw and Gertler would provide the relationship of the objects in a multimedia document for easily controlling and changing the presentation of the objects.

Claims 41-50 are for a computer system of the method claims 31-40, and are rejected under the same rationale.

14. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Gertler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ando (US Pat No. 5,600,826, 2/4/97).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw and Gertler do not disclose that each object has an address indicating a player that plays the object.

Ando discloses that each object has an object identifier that stores the position information of a data element (col 1, lines 9-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Ando into Shaw and Gertler since Ando provides the object identifier, which is an object address, to recognize the object in the multimedia document to be played.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Shaw and Gertler do not disclose compressing information in each object.

Ando discloses a data compression/development device can, of course, be incorporated into a structured data processor (col 6, lines 38-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Ando into Shaw and Gertler since Ando has the ability of compressing data for high-speed data transmission. This implies there is also an information compressing in each object.

15. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Gertler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Johnson (US Pat No. 5,892,847, 4/6/99, filed 4/22/96).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, which are dependent on claims 1 and 5 respectively, Shaw and Gertler do not disclose defining as well as locating the update splash image within the data file.

Johnson discloses:

- splash image data defining a splash image and locating the splash image data within the data file for displaying the splash image on the computer display (col 4, lines 30-50)
- further updating the splash image to be displayed (col 4, lines 30-63)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Johnson into Shaw and Gertler since Johnson shows the process of displaying of a splash image, which is an element of a multimedia document.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 13-16, 31-50, 63-84 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Shaw does not teach or suggest encapsulating within a single file at least two objects where each object includes data for the object and choreography information where the choreography information is defined by a document author and comprises data defining an explicitly relationship between the objects within a multimedia document to dictate a temporal order of presentation between the objects.

Examiner does not agree completely.

Shaw discloses creating a slide show presentation including at least two slides in the slide presentation where the whole slide presentation is considered as a single multimedia file and each slide, which is considered as an object, includes data for the slide (pages 396-402). Since the whole slide presentation is a single file including at least two slides, which are considered as the objects, there should be an encapsulating of these at least two objects within a single file.

The only thing Shaw does not teach is that each slide, which is an object, also include the choreography information in conjunction with the data for the object where the choreography information is defined by a document author and comprises data defining an explicitly relationship between the objects within a multimedia document to dictate a temporal order of presentation between the objects.

Gertler, in combination with Shaw in this office action, discloses that each slide includes a footer where the author can define any information for the slide such as Date or Slide

Number (pages 113, 117-118). Gertler further discloses the document author can rearrange the slide show to get things in a more logical order by selecting the desired slides you want to move to change the order (page 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gertler to include the information for rearranging the slide show in the footer of the slide beside the slide number since the footer can include whatever information for each slide.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Gertler into Shaw to enhance the creation of a multimedia file including at least two objects where each object includes data for each object and the choreography information defining the temporal order of presentation between the objects for the following reason. Gertler provides the features of a slide such as each slide has a footer for including any additional information of the slide such as date, slide number, or whatever text. Gertler further provides the capability of rearranging the order of the slide show by selecting the slides to be included in the presentation where the selected slides do not follow the defined order. The fact that the order of the slide show can be rearranged by the author as desired shows that the rearranged order of presentation between the objects is independent of the order of the slide number defined by the author when first creating the slide show. In other words, the temporal order, which is equivalent to the rearranged order of the slide show, is independent of an order of object transmission.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Smith (US Pat No. 5,732,256, 3/24/98, filed 8/30/95).

Kozuka et al. (US Pat No. 5,818,435, 10/6/98, filed 6/12/95).

Moseley et al., Microsoft Office 97 Professional (Mastering), Sybex Inc., December 1996, pages 638-640, 644-651.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 707-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

clh
7/21/03